



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## IMPORTANT FACTORS IN THE QUESTION OF RESPONSIBLE BEHAVIOR

By Professor GEORGE FREDERICK ARPS

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

**I**T can not be emphasized too strongly at the outset that the question of responsibility is fundamentally a question of native endowment given emphasis and direction through the quickening influences of an ever-impinging environment.

That the emphasis as here suggested is by no means generally palatable is abundantly attested by the prevailing practices in organized educational agencies for the development of normal human beings and in the specially organized corrective agencies having to do with wayward youth, still plastic; and having to do with hardened adults whose character and habits have set like the plaster on our walls. Nor will such emphasis become universally tasty until subjective standards, points of view, are effectively displaced by the non-personal, the rigidly objective. Among other things such a reversal in standpoint involves complete abandonment of all forms of anthropomorphisms and the frank acceptance of physical and perhaps mental continuity. The children of man in such a view are regarded as the offspring of parents representing the culmination of the organic series of creation and are endowed with characters the ancestry of which, in the final analysis, reaches the plummet of evolutionary history. Such a view makes man and his children integrally related with the world—establishes kinship in open acknowledgment. Moreover, it involves the abandonment of an aprioristic transcendental moving principle which comes from nowhere, but is somewhere located in the human body. Obviously, educational leadership in so far as it operates under such a principle and from an anthropomorphic standpoint is false as measured by modern empiricism and by the test of conceivability as science knows the test.

McDougal<sup>1</sup> in commenting on such a materialistic view of behavior observes:

Under these conditions, the working hypotheses of the natural sciences become confidently held doctrines from which we feel ourselves able

<sup>1</sup> McDougal, "Mind and Body," p. 144. The writer does not wish to convey the misleading inference that this quotation represents McDougal as holding a materialistic position; in its original setting the complete paragraph fits McDougal's animistic beliefs.

to deduce the limits of the possible; and we seem able to rule out from our scheme of the universe all that confused crowd of obscure ideas which, under the names of magic, occultism, and mysticism, have been at war with science ever since it began to take shape as a system of verifiable ideas inductively established on an empirical basis. Once admit, on the other hand, that psychical influences may interfere with the course of physical nature "you don't know where you are," you can no longer serenely affirm that "miracles" do not happen; they may happen at any moment and may falsify the most confident predictions of physical science. Thus the gates are opened to all the floods of spiritualism and superstition of every kind which . . . seem to threaten to light up once more the fires of persecution and to drag down our civilization from its hardly-won footing upon the steep path of progress.

A frank adoption of the objective standard to which I have referred requires a knowledge of the architecture, function and endowment of the human organism. No teacher should practise the art and certainly not the science of education, no social reformer should attempt reformation, who does not possess some information regarding the psychophysical nature of the creature to be taught or reformed. To know the structure, function and general endowment of the human organism; to appreciate its physical relationship to the world in which it lives and to believe that the springs of action and behavior are essentially internal; these constitute the irreducible prerequisite to an intelligent understanding of responsible behavior. Not until then will the army of educators, penologists, criminologists, philanthropists link the question of responsibility and the function of punishment with an *a posteriori* view of the educative process. Least excusable is the absence of such orientation in higher education, for it is here that prospective teachers and social workers should acquire a viewpoint which is consonant with modern science.

It should also be emphasized that the human organism, in common with all living organisms, is immersed, as it were, in a sea of environmental stimuli which unlock the human organism's inherited forces which form its dynamic energy. The question of the relation of environmental stimuli and innate energy and the rôle of each in the development of the final adult behavior lies near at hand.

The current and historical views regarding the efficiency of each or both of these factors in human development may be sufficiently classified into three groups: (1) The absolute efficacy of hereditary characteristics, (2) the absolute efficacy of the environment, and (3) the joint product of native endowment and environmental stimuli.

The first view involves the belief in a rigid physiological

teleology in which the end, *i. e.*, adult character, lies embedded in the matrix of inheritance. In this matrix is found the *termini a quo* and *ad quem* of behavior. From this point of view the adult character, as the culmination of its resident end, potentially exists in embryonic life and each stage in its development may be regarded as a fatalistic realization of this character. The budding, developing child grows unerringly according to inherited mandates lodged in its constitution; this growth takes place without let or hindrance which may be devised by organized social agencies. In such a view the pre-organized adult elements of behavior constitute active forces seeking out from among the environmental sea of nature's stimuli those destined, by the scheme of things, to actualize these elements. A fitting dictum for such a position is: "A silk purse may not be made out of a sow's ear." "Hewers of wood and drawers of water" are with us, always have been, always will be and this because of unequal endowment, certainly not by reason of the absence of social and educational opportunities.

Logical consistency would seem to require that the exponents of this view push the intrinsic character backward beyond the given infant to the entire strain which constitutes its long lineal descent. Variety of character, it would seem, is bounded by the varying degrees of dominance of the elemental characters comprising the strain. Each fertilized egg of such a strain may represent a unique combination of self-sufficient forces which spin themselves to adult realization according to intrinsic laws. But the designation of such forces as 'self-sufficient' or 'self-determined' are as empirically barren as an entelechy or any of the tribe of animistic principles. Empirical demands are perhaps more completely satisfied when the forces are regarded as chemical correlates or perhaps better as dynamic relations in which the integrative factor is some dominant metabolic wave or gradient of activity.<sup>2</sup>

There is much in the world which lends color to such a view. In the biological field consider certain of the modern conceptions, such as the congenital tendencies to criminality or the tendency of supernormal persons to insanity. Move a little higher up (or a little lower down, depending on your point of view) on the social ladder and consider the millions of social derelicts who are unable to carry their own load in the world, millions more who are scarcely able to cling to the

<sup>2</sup> E. M. Child, "The Basis of Physiological Individuality in Organisms," *Science*, N. S., Vol. XLIII, pp. 1-12.

sod of bare subsistence. These cases typify the dictum that "some mortals are not so much born into the world as damned into it" and lend color to the belief that man is *in toto* a product of the virile determinants lodged in his constitution. The inevitable consequence is clear—constitutional limitations whether of the over- or under-emphasis variety with certain surety consign such mortals to the lowest rung of the ladder of responsibility, and this constitution is the terminus which can not be transcended by pedagogical devices, however adept the pedagogue or refined his tools. Here dispositional tendencies appear as protruding energies *seeking out* mechanically or animistically, as you will, that environment which is appropriate for their realization. That environment which is relatively or wholly disregarded is viewed as non-contributory to the actualization of innate tendencies. From this point of view, education is not so much a 'drawing-out process' by organized or unorganized educational agencies as it is a 'drawing-in process,' in which the environment plays a passive rôle. What we find here is an operation strictly internal.

Frankly, this view makes an end of individual responsibility and prohibits punishment. In so far as the question can become a question at all it must rest with the immediate or remote progenitors of the individual. What we actually find here is an infinite regress in which each member of a pair of progenitors points to his father and mother as responsible for the character he possesses. We find in this view a fatalism so rigid as to make utterly futile the efforts of organized and unorganized educational agencies for the betterment of mankind.

That our theologians have overlooked this modern form of biological predestinarianism does not argue favorably for their argumentative brilliancy.

Fortunately such an extreme view shows the usual fate and merit of all extreme views in that out of the extremity there remains a workable precipitate which may be followed with safety. Causal efficacy of the factors involved in the determination of adult character will of course vary endlessly; now it will be given to heredity, now to environment. As illustrative of the emphatic, though by no means representative of the extreme view referred to, insistence on the hereditary factor, the views of A. J. Rosanoff<sup>3</sup> are quoted. Speaking of the alcoholic adult character he says:

How does one become an alcoholic? The prevailing view is that through example, or suggestion, or by way of sociability, one is initiated and eventually habituated to the use of alcoholic beverages in gradually increasing amounts.

<sup>3</sup> Lecture given before the Psychology Club, Ohio State University.

This is true as far as it goes; but it is equally true that under *any given conditions*, favorable or unfavorable, some persons will and others will not become alcoholic; the difference is between the persons. A great many can drink and even drink to excess without becoming alcoholic, in the specific sense of the term.

To become an alcoholic one must not only drink alcoholic beverages; one must be "alcoholizable." Being "alcoholizable" seems to consist of a constitutional weakness, derived from *bad heredity*.

*Heredity*, therefore, is not only the direct essential cause of probably two thirds of all cases of mental disorder, but is indirectly responsible for most of the alcoholic cases as well.

Bad heredity is thus the cause of causes, and upon it must be concentrated the bulk of preventive effort.

Among the measures that have been advocated for the prevention of bad heredity, the most important are restriction of marriage, sterilization, and segregation.

Segregation is not only practicable, but also effective; and we are justified in telling our legislatures that mental health is purchasable; mental disorders can be reduced by dollars and cents spent for segregation in this generation.

The mental disorders now prevailing amongst us are the heritage of untold generations of neglect of segregation.

The views of Rosanoff are extreme, but not of the extremist to which I have referred.

The apostles of the extremist view when confronted with the practical question, What is your prescription for the betterment of mankind? What is your recipe for the development of responsible human behavior? replies that the 'gladdening oil' must be put upon the 'squeak' far below the stage of adult existence. The source of human supply, the procreative function, is the fulcrum under which the lever of human uplift must be applied. Sentiment and sympathetic bosh must give way to cold calculation which rests on eugenic authorities if race recruiting is, in the main, to be other than from submerged families. Organized charities and corrective agencies alleviate those 'damned into existence' but in no wise prevent the constantly recurring 'damnation.' From the non-emotional point of view there is here "much sweetness wasted on the desert air."

There is no surcease from this stream of sorrow until the "legislative representatives of all the people" seek guidance from eugenic authority for the enactment of remedial legislation to prevent the propagation of those predestined to give steady employment to the 'social uplifter.' Until such legislation becomes operative social betterment can only be of the temporary variety, that is, only for the existing crop of social derelicts. Social alleviation under existing laws and conditions is literally an endless process of bailing out the boat without

stopping the leaks. The increase in crime and irresponsibility generally would seem to indicate that in no distant future the leakage in bids fair to exceed the bailing out. In Ohio, according to recent statistics, the jail population in the decade 1906-1916 increased to the disquieting extent of 42.0 per cent.<sup>4</sup>

The second view, namely, the absolute efficacy of environment, is obviously so obsolete in responsible scientific circles that it may be dismissed without further consideration. This view, like the preceding, view fails to avoid the 'falsehood of extremes.'

If we adopt the third view, the position that behavior is the joint product of native endowment and acquired responses, we find not only individual, but collective, responsibility as well. It is then that the 'tail' of behavior goes with the 'hide' of inheritance and experience. This view is a compromise conclusion between the strict hereditarians and euthenists who insist that immediate conditions control the destinies of men.

The compromise position maintains that the first essential to responsible behavior demands that every infant shall be well born, free from the heavy hand of incurable diseases which, with fatal surety, ring the death knell of efficient if not honorable existence. Important as is the factor of birth, no one except the restricted group to which I have referred, I think, would maintain that desirable birth is a safe insurance against irresponsible behavior; beyond affording a secure foundation for character formation no social virtues perhaps can be claimed for it.

The fact to be emphasized here is that a desirable hereditary soil is but a part of the problem of responsible behavior. That this is not the whole of the problem becomes clearer when it is remembered that the weeds of irresponsible behavior also thrive and strike deep their roots in such a soil. Witness the unconvicted, expert, intelligent criminals in certain of our professions. The terms 'shyster' and 'quack' readily suggest themselves. These social weeds are not indigenous to imbecilic or even moronic soil. It is equally important that every child be well reared. This is, in part, society's function. No one, I think, would seriously maintain that the rise and fall of past civilizations, in any other sense than contributory, are results of feeble-mindedness, nor, I think, will it be seriously maintained, unless normality has disappeared, that the fifteen (more or less) men who two and three fourths years ago

<sup>4</sup> T. H. Haines, "The Increasing Cost of Crime in Ohio," p. 8.

plunged the entire world into an unparalleled sea of blood and sorrow, depriving thousands of helpless babies of their feeding-bottles, were irresponsible because of congenital, incurable diseases. Nor does it seem probable that the greatest dangers which may befall our great republic lie in the irresponsible conduct of our feeble-minded population. One so-called responsible, well-bred (not well-educated) directing head of an influential metropolitan newspaper, or a glib-tongued, self-seeking, not-very-near statesman may rock the underpinnings of society far beyond the combined influences of an entire state's population of derelicts. This, the most dangerous form of irresponsibility, is a plain matter of brain organization. The brain considered prior to formal organization is endowed with certain powers and capacities—inborn traits—which through environmental conditions become specific habits of response. What the schools or any other social agency probably can not do at all is to create intellect, to create capacities; the most that may be expected by any form of environmental influences and conditions is to determine the channels in which innate intellectual traits shall become specific. In other words, how a normal human being specifically behaves depends upon the after-effects which environmental forces leave in the bodily tissues, more especially the nervous tissues. The ethics of an individual probably does not transcend the bundle of habits acquired by outward agents impinging upon the sense-organs and originating nerve-currents which channel their way, as it were, through the brain to the muscles. The effect of such a process by virtue of the extraordinary plasticity and retentivity of neural tissue remains a permanent possession of the body so long as the tissues endure. Any line of print or talk falling upon the eye or ear-gate leaves its indelible, ineffaceable imprint and becomes a lasting determinant of conduct. The sum total of these determinants grouped and classified into more or less specific habits of greater or lesser degree of perfection constitutes and circumscribes character.

The entire body seems to be made over, seems to undergo a molecular readjustment by the kind of environmental nourishment to which it responds. Carpenter<sup>5</sup> long ago pointed out that the organism grows to "the mode in which it is habitually exercised." It is proverbial that this 'growing to' process, this organization of the brain to respond in definite ways, takes place most readily during childhood when the bodily tissues are extraordinarily plastic and retentive. It is clear that early

<sup>5</sup> "Mental Physiology."

anti-social brain-organization gives rise to pitiful attempts at reformation later. Carpenter goes on to say that what is early learned "becomes branded in (as it were) upon the cerebrum; so that its 'traces' are never lost, even though the conscious memory of it may have completely faded out. For, when the organic modification has been once *fixed* in the growing brain, it becomes a part of the normal fabric, and is regularly maintained by nutritive substitution; so that it may endure to the end of life, like the scar of a wound."

The late William James<sup>6</sup> in his incomparable style expresses the results of Carpenter's 'growing to' process as follows:

It (habit) alone is what keeps us all within the bounds of ordinance, and saves the children of fortune from the envious uprisings of the poor. It alone prevents the hardest and most repulsive walks of life from being deserted by those brought up to tread therein. It keeps the fisherman and the deckhand at sea through the winter; it holds the miner in his darkness, and nails the countryman to his log-cabin and his lonely farm through all the lonely months of snow. In most cases, by the age of thirty, the character has set like plaster, and will never soften again.

Again James says:

The hell to be endured hereafter, of which theology tells, is no worse than the hell we make for ourselves in the world by habitually fashioning our characters in the wrong way. Could the young but realize how soon they will become mere walking bundles of habits, they would give more heed to their conduct while in the plastic state. We are spinning our own fates, good or evil, and never to be undone. Every smallest stroke of virtue or of vice leaves its never so little scar. The drunken Rip Van Winkle excuses himself for every fresh dereliction by saying, "I won't count this time!" Well, he may not count it, and a kind Heaven may not count it; but it is counted none the less. Down among his nerve cells and fibers the molecules are counting it, registering and storing it up to be used against him when the next temptation comes. Nothing we ever do is, in strict scientific literalness, wiped out.

Pathological cases are not wanting which indicate that the brain is endowed with this extraordinary degree of retentivity and that every sense stimulation reaching the brain leaves its undeniable trace there. Some of these impressions seem to sleep in the brain tissues like the camera's picture sleeps in the collodion film to be revived only by unusual conditions of cerebral disease or accident. The case cited by Coleridge and quoted by Carpenter and James is illuminating.<sup>7</sup>

In a Roman Catholic town in Germany, a young woman who could neither read nor write, was seized with a fever, and was said by the priests to be possessed of a devil, because she was heard talking Latin, Greek and Hebrew. Whole sheets of her ravings were written out and found to

<sup>6</sup> "Principles of Psychology," Vol. 1, pp. 121, 12.

<sup>7</sup> "Principles," Vol. 1, p. 681.

consist of sentences intelligible in themselves, but having slight connection with each other. Of her Hebrew sayings, only a few could be traced to the Bible, and most seemed to be in the Rabbinical dialect. All trick was out of the question; the woman was a simple creature; there was no doubt as to the fever. It was long before any explanation, save that of demoniacal possession, could be obtained. At last the mystery was unveiled by a physician, who determined to trace back the girl's history, and who after much trouble, discovered that at the age of nine she had been charitably taken by an old Protestant pastor, a great Hebrew scholar, in whose house she had lived till his death. On further inquiry it appeared to have been the old man's custom for years to walk up and down a passage of his house into which the kitchen opened, and to read to himself in a loud voice out of his books. The books were ransacked and among them were found several of the Greek and Latin Fathers, together with a collection of Rabbinical writings. In these works so many of the passages taken down at the young woman's bedside were identified that there could be no reasonable doubt as to their source.

These principles of growth so forcibly set forth point with unmistakable clearness the way to social reconstruction; they constitute common grounds of procedure for all except a negligible minority of extreme eugenists and euthenists. What then are some of the implications involved in the frank acceptance of the doctrine that adult human beings are the result of a 'growing to' process and that the final result of such a process is a number of fixed habits of conduct which habits become the major premises of behavior?

First, society must curtail the procreative function, eliminating the future presence of infants which beyond a reasonable doubt are incapable of 'growing to' stable manhood. This means the elimination from Ohio alone of several thousand helpless dependents, absolute charges who carry not so much as a fraction of their own load in the world. Moreover this gains enormously in significance when such elimination would divert annually several millions of dollars to the 'growing to' process for infants relatively free from the handicap of incurable diseases. This by no means eliminates the 'hewer of wood and drawer of water' type, but it does signify the rejection of those who are unable to 'hew and draw' their own sustenance. Wisdom would seem to dictate the adoption of the eugenic program of elimination. The program is everywhere conservative, free from weak sentimentalism, impassionate and has the force of science behind it. Our mistaken notion of personal liberty has led us into the grievous error of permitting this problem to solve itself. Dr. Terman<sup>8</sup> in a recent article sounds the following warning:

The problem is not one that can be left to its own solution, because there is no solution short of positive state action. The longer the menace

is neglected, the more threatening it becomes. In the last few decades the rate of reproduction among the socially fit has rapidly declined, but the feeble-minded continue to multiply at an undiminished rate. At the same time very beneficent social agencies and organized charities, necessary and humane as these are, nevertheless often contribute to the survival of individuals who would otherwise not be able to live and reproduce. The result is an ever-increasing proportion of socially unfit individuals in our state's population, and the problem can be met only by such an extension of the state's care of the feeble-minded, particularly of the high grades of feeble-minded, as will curtail the reproduction of defectives.

Second. The 'growing to' process does not admit the introduction of an unseen, transcendental power in the determination of human conduct. It is true that the brain may be organized, may 'grow to' the most absurd beliefs in anthropomorphism, if only the outward agents are favorable. Such beliefs, however, are habits and as such become vital determinants of behavior, but this must not be construed to mean that some superhuman agent steps in and makes decisions or choices by actually moving muscles. All beliefs are habits and their values in the final analysis must stand the test of character—do they or do they not sustain society? Measured by the pragmatic criterion alone, it would perhaps not be difficult to make out a case for our common species of revivals; especially is this true when it is remembered that most of the children of men have not paid the price to understand science and philosophy as they bear on this important question. Anthropomorphic habits, pierced by scientific and philosophic insight, as a rule, become inoperative. Certain of this class of habits are to my mind little short of pernicious. Reference is particularly drawn to the fatal notion that youth may sin with impunity and that at a more convenient hour a beneficent cleansing may be had for the asking. This is Rip Van Winkleism par excellence. "Nothing we ever do is, or ever can be, in strict scientific literalness, wiped out." Human behavior is a joint product of the interaction of inward and outward forces; the visible effects of such interaction are habitual modes of response. Could youth but realize that each experience leaves forever its unimaginable touch on the brain, that it is engraved there as with a steel stylus, they would give more heed to their conduct while in the plastic state. This simple incontestable truth does not seem to have seriously possessed many of our educational leaders, much less, therefore, the teachers who are in the more immediate presence of the brains of children. It seems to be asking too much of our educators and social workers to know even in a general way the architecture of the body, the system of peripheral and

<sup>s</sup> "Feeble-minded Children in the Public Schools of California."

central wiring which is the very foundation of behavior so long as the weighty problem of making one box of chalk do the work of two or how to save an adult derelict remains unsolved.

Third. *What* the organism 'grows to,' *what* habits the adult finally possesses, is largely of society's making. We may fairly ask then what are some of the harmful outward social forces which leave their ineffaceable effects in the nervous system, which effects then become determinants of human behavior. No need to recount all of them! the list is as long as it is wearisome; then too we have lived in the midst of these baneful social agencies so long that the average human being becomes so completely adapted that he is as likely to be cognizant of them as he is of his own shortcomings. Need I mention the gun-toting scenes with their inflammable red setting, the scenes depicting man's inhuman treatment of womankind now so common in our melodramatic movies? The inevitable result of this form of brain 'branding' is practical enactment of similar scenes in real life. Corroboration of this point of view is not lacking in the courts of domestic relations and in juvenile delinquency. Not without reason do we find waves of crime with greater frequency and higher crests in our republic than in the more stable European lands. In one crime, perhaps the crime of crimes—the crime of war—Europe stands without a peer. The whole world bleeds and is in sorrow to-day because each European nation has insisted for many generations in organizing the brains of its citizens to look with suspicion, envy and even hatred upon the citizens of neighboring states. Fratricidal tendencies have thus been nurtured in the greenhouse of the brain and now these tendencies have ceased to be such and become actualities. Need I mention the flood of devitalizing, spineless, mushy reading which annually soaks the brains of thousands of young girls and effeminate boys and this at a time when the tissues are most plastic, most retentive? Great gobs of sobbing situations are written into the nerve cells, fibers and molecules and there maintained by 'nutritive substitution' as long as the body endures. Need I mention the eye and ear stimulations which emanate from the open saloon, from dens as varied as the tints and shades of spectral colors, from the line of talk common to our side-street pool rooms and dance halls? Think of this collection of social stimuli; think of them finding permanent lodgment in the molecules; think of society placing such a menu in the hands of juvenescent, romantic youth and he who runs may understand the genesis of a large fraction of irresponsible behavior in the world. Need I add to

this collection that fraction of the daily press which with zeal and devotion worthy of a nobler cause regales the public hunger with recitals of human weaknesses and frailties? How often do the Magdalenes, of high or low degree, occupy the headlines! As Thackeray so well says:

Who would meddle with dull virtue, humdrum sentiment, or stupid innocence, when vice, agreeable vice, is the only thing which the readers of romance care to hear. (In "Henry Esmond.")

When it is remembered that the daily sheet constitutes the main reading diet of a large percentage of families and that these families are important race-recruiting centers, then the brain organization effected by this medium assumes no inconsiderable importance. It is no psychologic dream or piece of sentimental fiction to charge three national tragedies to the malignant influence of an irresponsible press. The collective effect is far from social assassination. And now we find this invidious yellow creature invading England, where bloom the choicest flowers of modern journalism. Two classes of people escape this form of brain 'branding'—those who can not or do not read and those who, in the interest of mental hygiene, quarantine their homes against this modern plague. Need I mention the softening effect on character attending excessive indulgence in fictitious joys and sorrows enacted on the modern stage? James<sup>9</sup> says,

Every time a resolve or a fine glow of feeling evaporates without becoming practical fruit it is worse than a chance lost; it works positively to hinder future resolutions and emotions from taking the normal path of discharge.

Weeping over fictitious situations may actually inhibit weeping over a real situation, so thoroughly does the brain 'grow to' the mode in which it is exercised.

The remedy would be never to suffer one's self to have an emotion . . . without expressing it afterward in *some* active way.

Heraclitus is said to have been perpetually weeping on account of the vices of mankind. Contrasting with Heraclitus is Democritus, the Laughing Philosopher, who is said to have made jests of the follies, sorrows and struggles of mankind. The modern Heraclitus, the Weeping Philosopher, fulfils his lachrymous duties most readily when human sorrows, struggles and follies are presented in fictitious personages. A Democritic attitude would be far less fatal and may be constructive

<sup>9</sup> "Principles," Vol. 1, p. 125.

in its effect if the 'glow of emotion' aroused by a given fictitious situation leads to some response noble in character.

From the foregoing we may conclude that the problem of character formation, the development of responsible human behavior, demands (1) that society shall have a voice in determining with what kind of brain the human infant shall begin his struggle with the environment and (2) what outward agents shall determine the direction of its organization. Now, brain organization from this point of view covers what is commonly denominated as *will*. In the popular mind *will* is something free and indeterminate; from one point of view will is determinate, entirely a product of innate tendencies operating in an environment. In a somewhat narrow sense, will, in all likelihood, has no existence outside of acquired habits and the conflux of those habits. So-called strong wills are results of certain virile tendencies which, through the ministration of a favorable environment, have issued into habits which dominate all other tendencies to response. If environment fashions voluntary behavior out of general innate qualities, then man may be said to possess wills rather than will, the variety being co-ordinate with the more or less habituated responses. For this reason the same human being may reveal unflinching integrity and probity in meeting financial obligations and scandalously betray the municipality, state or the nation. The bundle of habits of which we are composed appears to be specific. Man's architecture is initially, *i. e.*, in infancy, singularly vague and general while in adulthood we find man more or less completely fashioned to act slavishly, irresistibly according to the mode of behavior which innate tendencies and environment have forged into habits. The belief in free will, a capricious, lawless, causeless, transcendental force, is itself a habit; the tenacity with which it is held is a fair measure of the extent to which the habit has become ingrained.

The 'growing to' process of which we have now so frequently spoken finds its terminus then in habits which constitute the very essence of behavior responsible or otherwise. Moreover it is not too sweeping a statement to say that the entire growth of human behavior comprises responses in varying degrees of habituation. No one, I think, would seriously maintain that our theologies are inherited; on the contrary they are acquired possessions like the multiplication table. Consequently we find the Baptist worshiping according to the appropriate baptismal tenets not because from the first he can not help doing so, as the cat pursues the mouse, but because his

brain has received the baptismal treatment. In other words, our beliefs are habits which probably differentiate but little with respect to values. It is not the purpose of this paper, however, to place values upon acquired responses; it is rather our purpose to trace the genesis, the ontogenetic evolution of behavior, whether responsible or irresponsible, efficient or inefficient. Upon society must rest the onus of a large percentage of irresponsible behavior; society pretty largely must answer for the crowded dockets of every link in the chain of our courts so long as 'soft pine' brains are permitted to multiply with abandonment and so long as sound brains run the open gauntlet of all forms of vice which are permitted to flourish with impunity. Each item on the docket is largely of society's own making and in the manner already indicated; each individual conviction is an indictment of society, in so far as each offender is in no wise responsible for the brain he possesses and only in part responsible for such organization, such 'branding' as it receives. In a very true sense society and more especially the intellectually *élite* is on trial.

By permissive negligence of society, an inmate of an asylum, or other detention institution, is more sinned against than sinning. The total institutional population is a fair inverse index of social health. Organized agencies for human alleviation is society's intuitive method of repentance.

Huxley observes that man has made no physical progress since the days of recorded history. To this, in view of recent European events, let us add the lack of certain aspects of moral progress. The remedy now at hand seems to rest on a detailed empiricism of modern science which, acting in conjunction with the speculative disciplines, offers the chief hope of man's physical and moral redemption. This remedy involves a frank acceptance of an *uncompromising* scientific puritanism. This newer puritanism will insist on the following: (a) Purging the human stock of strains congenitally without hope, (b) reduction of individual license by stiffening governmental control, (c) reconstruction of beliefs by making them consonant with the generally accepted tenets of modern science and (d) insurance of responsible behavior by organizing the brains of children through adequate control of environmental agencies.

In conclusion let it be said that here as elsewhere responsible behavior depends more upon sound morals than anything else and sound morals are sound habits due to sound parentage and a wholesome environment.